

#16  
10/15/02  
J. Gibbs

## IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

October 2, 2002

RECEIVED  
OCT 10 2002

Technology Center 2600

Applicant(s): Wayne D. GROVER, et al

For: PROTECTION OF ROUTERS IN A TELECOMMUNICATIONS NETWORK

Serial No.: 09/314 518 Group: 2665

Confirmation No.: 5305

Filed: May 19, 1999 Examiner: T. Tran

Atty. Docket No.: Thomp-L 4

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED JULY 3, 2002

Sir:

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed July 3, 2002.

Before discussing this paper, the Applicants call to the attention of the Examiner that, simultaneously with the filing of this Response, an Information Disclosure Statement was filed with the Office for this application. An acknowledgement that the cited documents were considered is requested with the reply to this paper.

In the Office Action, all the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for being anticipated by Ellinas, U.S. Patent No. 6 331 905.

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent Claims 1, 29 and 30 each require "the router table having an entry identifying an alternative route around an adjacent router to the protecting router in case of failure of the adjacent router".

Ellinas does not show this feature. In Ellinas, the collection of protection routes associated with a node (router) include the node whose failure is being protected